DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 382 CE 007 118

AUTHOR Spikes, William Franklin
TITLE A Comparative Study of Selected Faculty and Student Perceptions of the Quality of On-Campus and University Extension Courses.
PUB DATE 8 Apr 76
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference (17th, Toronto, Ontario, April 8, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; *Comparative Analysis; *Course Evaluation; Credit Courses; *Educational Quality; Faculty Evaluation; Geographic Location; Higher Education; Intelligence; Off Campus Facilities; Questionnaires; Statistical Analysis; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Universities; *University Extension
IDENTIFIERS Northern Illinois University

ABSTRACT

The study was designed to compare the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses of Northern Illinois University based upon the perceptions of selected faculty members and students. Two groups of students, 428 on campus and 516 off campus and 23 faculty members participated in the study. During the 1974-75 academic year, the sample responded to a 93-item instrument which elicited demographic information and an evaluation of the course elements and also contained a measure of intellectual ability (the Quick Word Test partial scale). Findings tended to support earlier research indicating that faculty members generally thought on-campus education was at least of an equal quality with that offered off-campus. Student responses differed significantly with earlier studies which supported the concept that off-campus education was of equal or greater quality than its on-campus counterpart. Students in this study indicated that on-campus courses were of a far superior quality when compared to similar ones off-campus. Responses were analyzed by using a one-way analysis of variance, a two-way analysis of variance, a dependent-test, and a Scheffe analysis for multiple comparisons. The report lists 27 references and includes a five-page bibliography. (Author/MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123382

A Comparative Study of Selected Faculty and Student Perceptions of the Quality of On-Campus and University Extension Courses

A Paper Presented at the
17th Annual
Adult Education Research Conference

Toronto, Canada

April 8, 1976

by

William Franklin Spikes, Ed.D.
Director of Continuing Education

Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE007118

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to compare the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses of Northern Illinois University based upon the perceptions of selected faculty members and students. Two groups of students, 428 on campus and 516 off campus, and 23 faculty members from the Colleges of Business, Education, and Professional Studies participated in this study.

Each participating faculty member was asked to distribute a ninety-six item instrument to every student enrolled in the previously designated on-campus and off-campus course. This questionnaire consisted of three sections: (1) the first asked for demographic information; (2) the second asked for student perceptions of the professor, of the course, text and readings, of the examinations and the papers and reports; and (3) a final section, the Quick Word Test partial scale, asked for responses to 15 questions designed to obtain a measurement of intellectual ability.

Faculty members were also given a three part instrument. In addition to demographic variables each professor was requested to respond to 44 questions about the on-campus course and to respond to an identical number of questions about the off-campus course in terms of their overall perceptions of the students, the course, text, readings, and preparation, the examinations and the papers and reports.

A one-way analysis of variance, a two-way analysis of variance, a dependent t-test, and a Scheffé test for multiple comparisons were used in analyzing the data.

Based upon the data the following results were indicated:

1. A significant difference (at the .05 level) was found between the total overall responses of the on-campus and off-campus students regarding the quality of on and off-campus courses. Based upon the total responses of the student participants, on-campus courses were perceived as being of a significantly higher quality than were off-campus courses.

2. On the basis of the seven variables by which the student responses were examined, the following results were indicated:

a. When examined by student age categories there was a significant difference (at the .05 level) in the perceived quality of the on-campus and off-campus courses. Students in the twenty-one to thirty and thirty-one to forty age range, when compared with students in other age ranges were the least supportive of both on-campus and off-campus courses. While there were only 17 students over fifty-one years of age who participated in the study, they were the most supportive of all students regarding the quality of courses.

b. When examined by student university status a significant difference (at the .05 level) was indicated in the perceived quality of the on-campus and off-campus courses. Undergraduate students, freshmen through seniors, perceived the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses as being significantly higher than did graduate students.

Graduate students perceived the quality of off-campus and on-campus courses as being significantly lower than did all other students.

c. Students from the College of Professional Studies perceived the quality of courses as being significantly different (at the .05 level) and greater in quality than did students from other colleges. Students from the College of Education and College of Business perceived the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses in a significantly different manner and were less supportive of all courses than were students from other colleges.

d. Faculty members perceived no significant differences in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses. Faculty participants in this study represented the Colleges of Business, Education, and Professional Studies.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this initial section of this paper is to present a review of the literature related to evaluating university extension programs. Computerized ERIC and Datrix searches were conducted in addition to reviewing related literature in a variety of university libraries. Direct communication with the National University Extension Association was also initiated by the author to assure that the information presented was as current as possible at the time of the initiation of this study.

To date there has been a limited amount of related research which has attempted to compare the quality of on-campus and off-campus university credit courses. Wilde,[1] in 1965, studied the quality of extension courses offered for credit at six state supported institutions of higher education in North Carolina. In his study on-campus courses were rated by students as being of significantly better quality than those courses offered off-campus in the areas of: (1) availability of instructional equipment and supplies, (2) availability of reference materials, (3) availability and ease of use of library facilities, (4) degree and amount of student participation, and (5) overall quality of the courses. In the same study students rated the off-campus course counterpart as being significantly greater in the areas of: (1) classroom conditions, (2) ease of securing and the availability of textbooks, (3) degree to which the course served the goals of the student, (4) amount of time that was available to see the instructor, (5) availability of courses and (6) quality of instructors. Faculty responses associated with Wilde's research supported the student perceptions of the quality of off-campus course work in the areas of:

(1) lack of instructional and reference materials for off-campus courses, (2) difficulty experienced by off-campus students in making use of library facilities, and (3) the higher degree of interest and participation that was present in the off-campus student population.[1]

Frandson,[2] in 1973, studied a selected group of University of California at Los Angeles extension students and faculty members.

The primary objective of this study was:

> . . . to test some assumptions which have been widely held about extension students:
>
> a) They are not well prepared academically
> b) They are less likely to complete their course work
> c) They do not perform well academically
> d) They are less motivated
> e) UCLA faculty tend to be more lenient, i.e. easier course and grading pattern, (in extension courses)

Frandson's findings were similar to those of Wilde[1] in the areas of learner motivation and participation and quality of instruction, when he indicated that: "The majority of faculty stated that their extension students were equally, or more motivated than their campus students." Wilde[1] also found that off-campus students rated the quality of instruction as being superior to that of on-campus courses. Frandson[2] supported this finding when he reported:

> In general, faculty are not more lenient. Certainly in concurrent courses there would be no basis for any discrimination of this kind. Moreover, the majority of faculty teaching XL (extension) courses stated that they covered the same material and graded on the same basis as in their campus courses.

In addition to these findings, Frandson[2] has also suggested that:

> (Extension students) are well prepared academically . . . (With) at least 50% of all extension students included in this study holding the baccalaureate degree. Another 16%-30% holding master's degrees (and) an additional 6% holding Ph.D.'s or professional degrees.

Clasen[3] studied the quality of off-campus courses at the University of Wisconsin and reported data similar to that of Wilde regarding the quality of faculty and of the instructional process in off-campus courses. He stated: "The argument that professors who teach off-campus, graduate level courses are inferior is not a valid one." Additionally, his study revealed the following responses when students were asked to reply to questions regarding the possible learning climate differences between on-campus and off-campus courses:

> Off-campus students were significantly more positive about their courses than were their on-campus counterparts. . . . Off-campus students felt that:
> (1) Their courses were focused more on their needs.
> (2) Their courses were influencing their thinking.
> (3) Their courses offered opportunities for first-hand learning.
> (4) They were able to apply what they learned.
> (5) Their courses were practical.

In summarizing these three studies the inference that ". . . Off-campus courses at the graduate level are inferior to the same courses on-campus," cannot be supported. However, as Clasen reported: "Off-campus courses may (indeed) be <u>different</u> from on-campus courses."[3]

While research specifically comparing the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses is limited, numerous writers have investigated the nature and academic abilities of the off-campus or evening college student.

As early as 1935, the level of aptitude of the adult evening college

student was being investigated in an attempt to determine if a difference existed between the intelligence level of the evening student and the day student. McGrath and Froman[4] studied the aptitude of evening school students at the University of Buffalo during the 1935-1936 school year. Their findings indicated that: (1) adult evening students had, on the average, a slightly superior aptitude to regular day students; (2) adult evening students tended to have previously superior academic training; (3) there was no difference between day and evening students on standardized aptitude test scores; and (4) grading standards appeared to be the same for both day and evening students. Farnum[5] agreed with these findings when, in comparing the academic aptitude of university extension degree students to that of day student counterparts, he found that both the evening student and the day student possessed an equivalent intelligence quotient of 110. Farnum based this assertion on a comparative study of extension and on-campus students at the University of Rhode Island. Statistical comparisons of the mean scores between the groups on the A.C.E. Psychological Examination and the Cooperative Reading Test showed that no significant differences existed between the groups. In 1961 Zahn[6] compared the abilities of extension and resident students at the University of California. She found that the average university extension student in the liberal arts program had a higher mental ability score than 70% of the college students upon whom the ability test was nationally standardized.

Ulmer,[7] in a related study which compared the classroom achievement of evening and day students in college courses, found that the evening students demonstrated achievement at the same or at a higher level than did the day students on standardized teacher made tests. In 1970 Puzzoli[8]

studied the teaching of university extension classes by tele-lecture at the West Virginia University. Courses in mining engineering and modern mathematics were given to college students on campus. Similar courses were also given to off-campus students at an extension center 268 miles from the main campus via the tele-lecture and electrowriter method. A comparative analysis of the achievement of the two groups showed that the achievement of the extension students was at least equal to or significantly greater than that of the on-campus university student aptitudes. He supported the previously cited findings when he stated: "On the basis of the data, the suggestion that off-campus students are inferior is questionable." Gibson,[9] in 1962, studied 2,035 university students who were classified as either day or evening participants. He compared the two groups using the following variables: student attitudes, study habits and course achievement. He reported that continuing education students received significantly higher grade point averages than did day students, and that, employed continuing education students achieved higher grades than did all other students surveyed.

Other factors concerning off-campus students' character and personality have been examined in several studies. Sackett,[27] in discussing off-campus student motivational characteristics, stated that: "Studies consistently point out that the evening student is more highly motivated than is the day student." Frandson,[2] similarly reported that:

> They, (the extension students) are highly motivated, (and that,) the majority of faculty stated that their extension students were either equally or more motivated than their on-campus students.

Clasen,[3] tended to support these findings when he stated that: "Off-campus instructors in the courses surely were dealing with high-quality students who were positively motivated toward their course work."

Despite these findings which are supportive of off-campus learning experiences, there exists considerable body of literature which questions the value of quality of off-campus, extension or evening university credit courses.

Sackett,[27] in discussing perceptions of faculty and administrators, reported that: "Many people both within and without the profession, look upon evening education as substandard at best." Nyquist[10] has tended to criticize evening programs as being too often devoted to entertainment rather than the dignity of higher education. Houle,[11] expressed a feeling that perhaps the quality of the courses was a major problem which caused much of the criticism of these programs. Peterson and Peterson[12] expressed a similar concern and have called for a level and quality of learning which is appropriate to a university.

McMahon[13] summarized the concerns of those who classify evening, adult, or off-campus courses as perhaps being inferior to day courses when he stated that: "There is a wide spread feeling both on and off the campus that standards are lower in higher adult education." This view was supported by Dyer,[14] and by Houle,[11] who stated that: "In at least some institutions, the offerings of the evening colleges and extension divisions tend to have lower standards than do their on-campus counterparts."

There are those who have felt that the issue of comparing standards of on-campus and off-campus was not a legitimate or valid concern. Porter[15] suggested that ". . . the misunderstanding of standards comes from the

belief that different standards from day programs seem to imply lower standards."

Morton[16] countered these inferences when he suggested:

> The belief that any standards different from campus standards are necessarily lower is obviously a fallacy. They can be practical and equality high standards although these will undoubtedly have to be distinctly different from traditional standards.

The literature, however, fails to present clear-cut evidence concerning the nature of standards for on-campus programs as compared to those for off-campus programs. McMahon,[13] in reporting on the debate regarding on and off-campus standards stated: "Despite all the discussion of standards, there is no objective data to prove that standards are lower in evening colleges."

Porter,[15] in studying faculty attitudes toward selected aspects of a university continuing education program at Syracuse University in 1969, found that a more favorable attitude was expressed toward continuing education by female faculty members than was expressed by male faculty members. Additionally, the investigator found that the faculty members who held the rank of instructor expressed a more positive attitude toward continuing education than did those who held the rank of professor. In the same study faculty members from professional schools were found to express a more favorable attitude toward continuing education than did those from liberal arts and sciences colleges. Porter[15] also reported that no significant difference existed in the expressed attitudes of faculty members toward continuing education when compared by age group, and that there was no significant difference between the responses of faculty members in the social sciences and those in the natural sciences. Dahle[17] however, in studying university faculty attitudes, found that the age of the respondent

was significant, and that faculty members over thirty-five years old expressed a more favorable attitude toward continuing education than did younger faculty members. He also reported that faculty members from the social sciences possessed the least favorable attitude toward continuing education of all faculty members studied and supported Porter's findings that professional school faculty members expressed the most favorable attitude toward continuing education. Carey[18] concluded that faculty members in the departments of business and education were more sympathetic toward continuing education than were those in other departments.

Other authors have provided evidence which tend to support the findings of Porter regarding the relationship of faculty rank to attitudes toward continuing education. Dahle,[17] in addition to discussing the relationship between attitudes toward continuing education and college affiliation found that those who held a lower academic rank seemed to be more favorable toward continuing education than did those holding a higher academic rank. Daigneault,[19] in a study involving twelve institutions suggested that senior faculty members regarded evening college teaching as an onerous task. However, Dekker[20] reported conflicting evidence when he suggested that faculty members who had reached a high academic rank found a greater relevance and appreciation of continuing education activities.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Recently the College of Continuing Education of Northern Illinois University as well as continuing education and extension programs at other universities throughout the nation have experienced a very significant rate of growth in the number of courses offered off-campus and an attendant increase in enrollment. With a head count enrollment of approximately 3,100 in the fall semester of 1973, 4,700 in the fall semester of 1974, and 5,500 in the spring semester of 1975, Northern Illinois University has become one of the largest extension programs in the State of Illinois, and has experienced a pattern of increasing growth typical of many other university extension programs during the past five years. With this continuing increase in enrollment came a request from faculty, staff and students of that institution for an intensive comparative investigation of the equality of courses offered on and off campus. Some faculty members at Northern Illinois had characterized off-campus courses as being step-children of on-campus courses, with others viewing off-campus courses as having superior instructors and more enthusiastic students.[25]

The dichotomy of thought inherent in these statements occasioned that research be performed to determine the relative quality of on and off-campus courses at Northern Illinois University. Until the development and implementation of the research reported on in this study, few studies had been performed which attempted to determine the quality of university sponsored off-campus credit courses. The need for such research was also indicated by the emphasis placed on the expansion of Northern Illinois University's off-campus mission in the Illinois Board of Higher Education's

proposed Scope and Mission statement, which stated:

> Northern Illinois University . . . should continue to develop a strong off-campus mission . . . offering graduate education . . . within an economically diverse and expanding region . . . (and) is also encouraged to explore the development of non-traditional programs.[26]

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the study was to compare the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses of Northern Illinois University based upon the perceptions of selected faculty members who taught the same course on and off campus and of students who were enrolled in these courses.

The objectives of the study were to:

1. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus courses and on-campus courses based upon the perceptions of students enrolled in the same course which was taught on and off campus by the same faculty member;

2. determine if there was a difference in perception of the quality of off-campus courses and on-campus courses among students who differed in age;

3. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus and on-campus courses among students who differed in university status;

4. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus and on-campus courses among students who differed in academic discipline;

5. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus and on-campus courses among students who differed in sex;

6. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus and on-campus courses among students who differed in intellectual ability as measured by the Quick Word Test partial scale;

7. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus and on-campus courses among students who differed in educational goals;

8. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus courses and on-campus courses among students who differed in grade point average;

9. compare the quality of off-campus and on-campus courses based upon the perception of faculty members who taught the same course on campus and off campus;

10. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus courses and on-campus courses among faculty members who differed in age;

11. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus courses and on-campus courses among faculty members who differed in sex;

12. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus courses and on-campus courses among faculty members who differed in professorial rank; and

13. determine if there was a difference in the perception of the quality of off-campus and on-campus courses among faculty members who differed in college of appointment.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to:

1. a sample of students who were enrolled in courses offered simul-

taneously, on campus and off campus by the same Northern Illinois University faculty member during the spring semester of the 1974-75 academic year;

2. a sample of Northern Illinois University faculty members who taught the same course on campus and off campus during the spring semester of the 1974-75 academic year;

3. students who were classified by Northern Illinois University as an undergraduate student, a graduate student, or a student-at-large;

4. faculty members who held the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor at Northern Illinois University;

5. courses which were offered for graduate credit or upper division undergraduate credit.

Statement of Hypotheses

Based upon these objectives, the general research hypotheses for this study were listed as follows:

H1. Faculty members who teach the same course on-campus and off-campus will perceive the quality of the on-campus course to be greater than that of the off-campus course.

H2. Students enrolled in the off-campus course that is taught by the same faculty member on-campus will perceive the quality of the off-campus course to be greater than do the students enrolled in the on-campus course.

The null hypotheses for this study were:

H1. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores of on-campus and off-campus students on the modified FACE instrument.

H2. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores on the modified FACE instrument when compared by the age groups of students.

H3. There is no significant interaction between course location and the age groups of students.

H4. There is no significant difference between the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores on the modified FACE instrument when compared by the university status of students.

H5. There is no significant interaction between course location and the university status of students.

H6. There is no significant difference between the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores on the modified FACE instrument when compared by the academic discipline of the students.

H7. There is no significant interaction between course location and the academic discipline of students.

H8. There is no significant difference between the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores on the modified FACE instrument when compared by the sex of the student.

H9. There is no significant interaction between course location and the sex of the student.

H10. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores on the modified FACE instrument when compared by the intellectual ability of students as measured by the Quick Word Test partial scale.

H11. There is no significant interaction between course location and the intellectual ability of students as measured by the Quick Word Test partial scale.

H12. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores on the modified FACE instrument when compared by the educational goals of students.

H13. There is no significant interaction between course location and student educational goals.

H14. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores on the modified FACE instrument when compared by self-reported student grade point average.

H15. There is no significant interaction between course location and self-reported student grade point average.

H16. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores on the modified FACE instrument of faculty members who teach the same course on and off campus.

H17. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores of faculty members on the modified FACE instrument when compared by professorial rank.

H18. There is no significant interaction between course location and the professorial rank of the faculty member.

H19. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores of faculty members on the modified FACE instrument when compared by college of the faculty members.

H20. There is no significant interaction between course location and the college of the faculty member.

H21. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores of faculty members on the modified FACE instrument when compared by age of faculty member.

H22. There is no significant interaction between course location and the age of faculty member.

H23. There is no significant difference in the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses based upon the mean scores of faculty members on the modified FACE instrument when compared by the sex of the faculty member.

H24. There is no significant interaction between course location and the sex of the faculty member.

Population and Selection of the Sample

The sample used in the study included two distinct elements: (1) faculty members of Northern Illinois University who taught the same course on campus and off campus during the spring semester of the 1974-75 academic year and who were willing to participate in this study, and (2) students enrolled in the on-campus and off-campus courses of the participating faculty members.

Table 1

Faculty Participants as Identified by College of Academic Appointment (N = 30)

College	Number of Faculty Participants	Percent of Faculty Sample
Business	8	26.70
Education	18	60.00
Liberal Arts & Sciences	1	3.30
Professional Studies	3	10.00
Visual & Performing Arts	0	00.00
TOTAL	30	100.00

Table 1 provides an analysis of faculty members by college who were contacted and agreed to participate in this study.[21]

Table 2 provides an analysis of the on-campus student sample by college who participated in this study.[22]

Table 2

On-Campus Student Participants as Identified
By College of Enrollment
(N = 699)

College	Number of On-Campus Student Participants	Percent of On-Campus Student Sample	Percent of Total Student Sample
Business	272	38.91	18.99
Education	349	49.93	24.39
Liberal Arts & Sciences	25	3.58	1.74
Professional Studies	53	7.58	3.72
Visual & Performing Arts	0	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	699	100.00	48.84

Table 3 provides an analysis of the off-campus student sample by college who participated in this study.[23]

Table 3

Off-Campus Student Participants as Identified by College of Enrollment (N = 733)

College	Number of Off-Campus Student Participants	Percent of Off-Campus Student Sample	Percent of Total Student Sample
Business	260	35.47	18.16
Education	430	58.66	30.00
Liberal Arts & Sciences	14	1.91	.97
Professional Studies	29	3.96	2.02
Visual & Performing Arts	0	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	733	100.00	51.15

For purposes of this study the assumption was made that the sample of off-campus students and on-campus students who participated in this research were of a similar nature and therefore were not randomly selected.

Kerlinger[24] has suggested that randomization is:

> . . . the assignment of objects of a universe to subsets of the universe in such a way that, for any given assigment to a subset, every member of the universe has an equal probability of being chosen for that assignment.

Ideally, assignment to the on-campus and off-campus participation groups would have been made in this manner. However, since the student participants had already individually chosen whether to attend an off-campus or an on-campus course, it was therefore not possible to use a randomized procedure in this study. Kerlinger, defines an ideal experiment as one in which all factors or variables would be known and controlled, but also states it is not likely that this could be done. While it was not possible to make use of random assignment techniques for the on-campus and off-campus groups, the assumption of similarity was supported by an examination of the demographic data available from the Northern Illinois University Office of Analytical Studies.[25]

Procedures for Data Collection

Data for this study were collected during April 1975. The following procedures were used to gather data which were related to the objectives and hypotheses of this study.

1. The criteria for participation based upon a review of the literature and the objectives of the study were developed by the investigator.

2. Participants who met these criteria were identified and selected from members of the Northern Illinois University faculty and student body.

3. Potential participants were contacted by the Assistant Dean of the College of Continuing Education at Northern Illinois University, informed about the nature of the study, and requested to participate in the data collection process.

4. Each potential participant was contacted by the investigators and provided with further information regarding the nature and design of the study.

5. A questionnaire, based upon the hypotheses and objectives of the study, a review of related literature, suggestions of the College of Continuing Education Advisory Council, and the Faculty and Course Evaluation Instrument designed by Alan L. Sockloff and Vincent T. Deabler[26] was constructed. The questionnaire was developed in two sections. The first was distributed to participating faculty members. The second portion was given to the on-campus and off-campus student participants.

6. The faculty portion of the questionnaire was submitted to a interdisciplinary panel of faculty members for critical analysis and review.

7. The student portion of the questionnaire was submitted to a representative sample of Northern Illinois University graduate students for critical analysis and review.

8. The faculty and student sections of the questionnaire were revised in accordance with the suggestions of the panel of graduate students and the panel of faculty.

9. The revised questionnaire and directions for administration were distributed to the faculty participants.

10. The questionnaire was administered in each class using the following procedures:

A. A uniform set of directions was read in each class by the participating faculty member;

B. Each student was then given a packet of materials which included a set of directions, a questionnaire, and a response sheet;

C. Participating students and faculty members completed the questionnaire and placed the response sheet in an envelope, which was then sealed by the professor in the presence of a designated class member, and returned to the investigator.

It was felt that by minimizing the contact that a faculty member would have with the response sheets, students would feel less threatened and give more accurate responses.

In an attempt to reduce any potential skewing of the data, several alternative methods for distribution of the questionnaire and collection of the responses were considered. Among these were: (1) to have each faculty member distribute the questionnaire and have the responses returned by mail, (2) have a staff member of the College of Continuing Education and the investigator personally distribute and collect the completed questionnaires, or (3) allow the distribution of the instrument by each faculty member in class and when completed have it returned in a sealed envelope to the investigator. Due to the difficulty in obtaining a satisfactory return via a mail response and the logistics of articulating a small staff to personally distribute and collect the questionnaires in the vast geographical area in which the off-campus courses were located, the third option was selected as the means by which the data were collected.

11. Each response was initially recorded on a 10 foil IBM answer sheet and was then transferred to a computer disc. The data were then analyzed, using a one and two way analysis of variance, a dependent t test, and a Scheffé test for multiple comparisons. All results were reported at the .05 level of significance.

The original sample for this study consisted of thirty faculty members and 1,432 students: 733 students were taking courses off-campus;

699 were enrolled in on-campus courses. Of these participants twenty-three respondents (or 76.66 percent) in the faculty sample and 944 respondents (or 66 percent) in the student sample completed the instrument. The seven faculty members who did not participate in the study indicated the following reasons for not doing so: (1) a lack of time due to administrative and other professional responsibilities prevented completion of the instrument; (2) a desire not to have the students evaluate the quality of instruction offered; (3) a lack of class time prohibited the completion of the instrument; and (4) a desire not to participate with no further reason expressed. Of the seven non-responding faculty members, two were from the College of Business, three from the College of Education, one from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and one from the College of Professional Studies. Table 4 presents an analysis of the corrected totals of faculty participants by college.

Table 4

Faculty Participants as Identified by
College of Academic Appointment
Corrected Totals
(N = 23)

College	Number of Faculty Participants	Percent of Faculty Sample
Business	6	26.10
Education	15	65.20
Liberal Arts & Sciences	0	0.00
Professional Studies	2	8.70
Visual & Performing Arts	0	0.00
TOTAL	23	100.00

Fifteen (65.20 percent) of the responding faculty members held appointment in the College of Education. Six faculty participants (26.10 percent) were from the College of Business. The remaining two faculty members (8.70 percent) held appointment in the College of Professional Studies. No faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences or the College of Visual and Performing Arts participated in the study.

The student sample for this study, after allowing for attrition caused by absenteeism on the day or evening when the instrument was completed or for the deletion of the total class at the request of the faculty member, consisted of 944 (or 66 percent) of the participants who were orginally contacted. Table 5 presents an analysis of the corrected total of the on-campus student participants. Of the on-campus students, 247 (58.10 percent) indicated a major area of study in the College of Education, 116 (27.30 percent) were from the College of Business, 38 (8.90 percent) represented the College of Professional Studies, 23 (5.40 percent) indicated the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as their major area of study, and 1 (.20 percent) represented the College of Visual and Performing Arts. The on-campus students comprised 45.50 percent (425 students) of the total student sample.

Table 5

On-Campus Student Participants as Identified by College of Enrollment Corrected Totals (N = 423)

College	Number of On-Campus Student Participants	Percent of On-Campus Student Sample	Percent of Total Student Sample
Business	116	27.30	12.40
Education	247	58.10	26.40
Liberal Arts & Sciences	23	5.40	2.50
Professional Studies	38	8.90	3.60
Visual & Performing Arts	1	.20	.10
TOTAL	425	100.00	45.50

Table 6 presents the corrected totals for the off-campus student participants. The off-campus students comprised 54.60 percent, 511 respondents, of the total student sample. Of the off-campus students 284 (55.70 percent) indicated a major area of study within the College of Education, 135 (26.40 percent) were pursuing major areas of study within the College of Business, 47 (9.20 percent) represented the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 41 (8.00 percent) were students majoring in the College of Professional Studies, and 4 (.80 percent) indicated major areas of study within the College of Visual and Performing Arts.

Table 6

Off-Campus Student Participants as Identified by College of Enrollment (N = 512)

College	Number of Off-Campus Student Participants	Percent of Off-Campus Student Sample	Percent of Total Student Sample
Business	135	26.40	14.40
Education	284	55.70	30.40
Liberal Arts & Sciences	47	9.20	5.00
Professional Studies	41	8.00	4.40
Visual & Performing Arts	4	.80	.40
TOTAL	511	100.00	54.60

The total student sample consisted of 531 (56.80 percent) respondents from the College of Education, 251 (26.80 percent) students from the College of Business, 78 (8.00 percent) students from the College of Professional Studies, 70 (7.50 percent) participants were majoring in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and 5 (.50 percent) students were from the College of Visual and Performing Arts. Five student respondents did not indicate a college of enrollment. Those values were declared missing and were excluded from Table 5 and Table 6.

Selection and Preparation of Instruments

The instruments used in this study were based upon the Faculty and Course Evaluation Instrument constructed by Sockloff and Deabler[6] at Temple University in 1971. Developed from work orginally performed by Kirk in 1968, the Faculty and Course Evaluation Instrument (FACE) was based upon a list of 300 evaluative characteristics found on over 100 institutional evaluation instruments by the Temple University Testing Bureau. The first version of the FACE Instrument was constructed by selecting 160 of the original identified descriptive statements to be used in a trial test procedure. The field tested form of the FACE was then again refined with each of the 160 items being factor analyzed and restructured to form the final 100 item questionnaire.

A University of California at Los Angeles study originally performed in 1973 was also used in the development of the instruments for this study.

Faculty Perception Scale

Using the FACE and the UCLA study as models, the instruments for this study were developed. The first, The Faculty Perception Scale, consisted of ninety-three items which were divided into three sections.

A. Section One - General Information. In this section each faculty member was asked to respond to five general questions; each of which represented a variable by which the faculty responses would be statistically analyzed. The variables included the age, sex, rank, college of appointment, and the amount of experience in teaching off-campus courses of each faculty member.

B. Section Two - Off-Campus Course. This section was divided into four subsections; each faculty member was asked to respond to questions

about specific aspects of the off-campus course. Subsections dealt with faculty perceptions of the off-campus student, and of the off-campus course, text, readings, the preparation and quality of the off-campus examinations, and of the off-campus papers and reports. A total of forty-four questions was included in this portion of the instrument.

c. Section Three - On-Campus Course. The third section of the Faculty Perception Scale was also divided into four subsections in which each faculty member was asked to respond to questions about specific aspects of the on-campus course. Subsections dealt with faculty perceptions of the on-campus student, of the on-campus papers and reports. A total of forty-four questions was included in this section of the instrument.

Student Perception Scale

The second instrument (given to both on-campus and off-campus students) that was used in this study was also developed using the FACE questionnaire and the University of California at Los Angeles study as models. The student perception scale consisted of ninety-six items which were divided into three sections similar to those of the Faculty Perception Scale.

Trial Testing Procedure

A trial test was performed in order to assure that the instrument developed for this study accurately reflected the issues and concerns present in related studies found in the literature, and to assure that the format and questions were presented in an easily readable and unambiguous fashion. An interdisciplinary panel of twenty-five faculty members and twenty students reviewed each instrument. The instrument was then reconstructed to reflect the suggestions of this panel of experts.

Representatives from the College of Continuing Education, the College of Business, the College of Education, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the College of Professional Studies, the College of Visual and Performing Arts of Northern Illinois University and of the ERIC Clearinghouse in Career Education were selected to serve on the faculty panel of field test participants. The student panel of field test participants included undergraduate, master's, and doctoral students from the College of Education and the College of Business of Northern Illinois University.

Summary of Findings

In accordance with the previously listed objectives and hypotheses, the following results were indicated:

1. A significant difference (at the .05 level) was found between the total overall responses of the on-campus and off-campus students regarding the quality of the on and off-campus courses. Based upon the total responses of the student participants, on-campus courses were perceived as being of a significantly higher quality than were off-campus courses.

2. On the basis of the seven variables by which the student responses were examined, the following results were indicated:

    a. When examined by student age categories there was a significant difference in the perceived quality of the on-campus and off-campus courses. Students aged twenty-one to thirty and thirty-one to forty were the least supportive of on-campus and off-campus courses. Students over fifty-one were the most supportive of courses in both locations. It must be noted however that of all students participating in this study (944), 17 (1.80 percent) indicated an age of fifty-one or greater. No significant

interaction was found to exist between age categories and course location.

b. When examined by student university status a significant difference was found in the perceived quality of the on-campus and off-campus course. Undergraduate students perceived the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses as being significantly higher in quality than did graduate students. No significant interaction was found to occur between course location and university status.

c. Perceptions regarding the quality of courses of on-campus and off-campus students were found to differ significantly when compared by academic discipline. Students from the College of Professional Studies perceived the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses as being significantly different and of greater quality than did students from other colleges. Students from the College of Education and College of Business perceived courses in a significantly different manner and were less supportive of on-campus and off-campus courses than were students from other colleges. No significant interaction was found between location and academic discipline. It should be noted that of the student sample, 251 (26.58 percent) were enrolled in the College of Business, 522 (55.29 percent) in the College of Education, 70 (7.41 percent) in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 79 (8.36 percent) in the College of Professional Studies, and 5 (.52 percent) in the College of Visual and Performing Arts.

d. A significant difference was found between the perceptions of male and female students regarding the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses. Male students were less supportive of both on-campus and off-campus courses than were female students. No significant interaction occurred between course location and sex.

e. When analyzed by student QWT score, courses were perceived as being of a significantly higher quality by those students in the high score group than by those in the low score group. No significant interaction was found between course location and QWT score.

f. When analyzed by student educational goals and location, a significant difference was found to exist in the perceptions of students based upon educational goals. Those students who indicated that the primary reason for their attendance was social in nature rated both on-campus and off-campus courses in a significantly differently manner and as being significantly higher in quality than did all other students. No significant interaction was found to exist between the goals of students and the course location.

g. There was no significant difference in the responses of students when analyzed by the location and student self-reported grade point averages.

3. When the total faculty responses were analyzed using a dependent t-test, no significant differences were perceived regarding the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses by the participating faculty members.

4. No significant differences were indicated in the perceptions of the participating faculty when analyzed by four variables: age, sex, professorial rank, and college of academic appointment. No significant interaction was found when faculty responses were analyzed by the aforementioned variables.

Conclusions

The conclusions presented below and the recommendations that follow were based upon:

1. a statistical analysis of the data;

2. knowledge gained from discussions with faculty members and students involved in this study; and

3. observations of on-campus and off-campus university credit courses of Northern Illinois University.

Conclusions drawn as a result of this study were as follows:

1. On-campus courses at Northern Illinois University tended to be perceived by students as being of a higher quality than off-campus courses.

2. Students over fifty-one years of age seemed to be the most supportive and to have had their needs more successfully met than all other age groups of students. Students in the twenty-one to forty age ranges seemed to be the least satisfied with on-campus and off-campus courses. Seventeen (2.0 percent) of the total student sample indicated ages of fifty-one or more.

3. The College of Professional Studies seemed to meet the needs of all students in the most satisfactory manner of all colleges. The College of Business and the College of Education seemed to be less successful in meeting the expressed needs of the on-campus and off-campus students. Seventy-nine (8.00 percent) of the total student sample were majoring in the College of Professional Studies.

4. Male students tended to perceive both on-campus and off-campus courses as being of a lower quality than did female students.

5. Those students who attended courses to primarily fulfill a knowledge or vocational goal seemed to be less satisfied with both on-campus and off-campus courses than were those students who expressed a desire to meet a social goal as their primary reason for attendance.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further study and investigation evolved as a result of this study:

1. Administrative units responsible for conducting university off-campus courses should undertake a continuing program of evaluation designed to determine the quality of off-campus learning experiences.

2. Longitudinal studies should be undertaken to determine if the perceptions of on-campus and off-campus students are related to the biological and sociological functions of the aging process.

3. Learning projects of adult students should be carefully analyzed with the resultant findings being used to develop programs of off-campus education.

4. Entire university faculties should participate in continuing research in order to obtain a more accurate assessment of the nature of faculty perceptions of the quality of on-campus and off-campus courses.

In summary, while this study resulted in data which supported or did not support several specific hypotheses, more questions have been raised that were answered. In that sense, the study provides a point of departure for further research.

REFERENCES

[1] Simpson Ownbey Wilde, "A Study of the Evaluation of Extension Courses Offered for Credit at Six State Supported Institutions of Higher Education in North Carolina" (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, North Carolina University, 1965).

[2] Phillip E. Frandson, Comparative Study Regular Session / University Extension Courses and Students (Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, Fall 1973).

[3] Robert E. Clasen, et. al., On Campus - Off Campus: A Comparison of the Demographic Characteristics, Attitudes, and Opinions of Students Enrolled in On and Off-Campus Graduate Level Exetnsion Courses (Madison: Center for Extension Programs in Education, University of Wisconsin), March 1969.

[4] Earl J. McGrath and Lewis Froman, "College Aptitudes of Adult Students", University of Buffalo Studies, Volume XIV, No. 1, November 1936, citing Duane H. Sackett, "A Descriptive Analysis of the Evening and Off-Campus Population, Temple University, Fall Semester, 1966-67", (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Temple University, 1969).

[5] Hollis B. Farnum, "A Comparison of the Academic Aptitudes of University Extension Degree Students and On-Campus Students", Journal of Applied Psychology, No. 16, 1957.

[6] Jane C. Zahn, "Comparative Ability of Extension and Resident Students at the University of California", (Unpublished, non-degree thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1961), citing Claude Touchette, Adult Education Through University Extension (Toronto, Ontario: Department of Adult Education, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968).

[7] Ronald Curtis Ulmer, "A Comparison of the Classroom Achievement of Evening and Day Students in College Courses", (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1966).

[8] David A. Puzzoli, A Study of Teaching University Extension Courses by Tele-Lecture (Morgantown: West Virginia University, 1970).

[9] James Edward Gibson, "A Study of Selected Factors and Attitudes Comparing Regular Day Students with Continuing Education Students" (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Arizona State University, 1962).

[10] Edwald B. Nyquist, "The Soft Pedagogy of Evening Colleges", Proceedings: AVEC Meeting (Atlanta, Georgia, 1970).

[11] Cyril O. Houle, Major Trends in Higher Adult Education, Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, (Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1959).

[12] Renee Peterson and William Petterson, University Adult Education, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960).

[13] Ernest E. McMahon, An End to Confusion, Notes and Essays on Education for Adults (Chicago: Center for the Study of Adults, 1965).

[14] John P. Dyer, Ivory Towers in The Market Place (New York: Bobbs Merrill Company, 1956).

[15] Lee Porter, "Faculty Attitudes Toward Selected Aspects of a Multidimensional University Continuing Education College", (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Syracuse University, 1969).

[16] John R. Morton, University Extension in the United States (Birmingham: University of Alabama Press, 1953).

[17] Thomas L. Dahle, "Faculty Attitudes Toward the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Oregon" (paper presented at the National Seminar on Adult Education Research, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1968).

[18] James T. Carey, Forums and Focus in University Adult Education (Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education of Adults, 1961).

[19] George H. Daigneault, Decision Making in the University Evening College, Research Reports (Chicago: Center for Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1963).

[20] Tunis Henry Dekker, "Faculty Commitments to University Adult Education", (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965).

[21] Northern Illinois University, "College of Continuing Education, 1975 Spring Semester Master List" (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1975).

[22] Northern Illinois University, "College of Continuing Education, 1975 Spring Semester Enrollment Record" (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1975).

[23] Personal correspondence between the investigators and each participating faculty member, March, 1975.

[24] Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research Second Edition (New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1973).

[25] Northern Illinois University Office of Analytical Studies, "On-Campus Student Profile" (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, March, 1975).

[26] Alan L. Sockloff and Vincent T. Deabler, The Construction of the Faculty and Course Evaluation Instrument (Philadelphia: Temple University Testing Bureau, 1971).

[27] Duane H. Sackett, "A Descriptive Analysis of the Evening and Off Campus Population, Temple University, Fall Semester, 1966-67" (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Temple University, 1969).

BIBLOGRAPHY

BIBLOGRAPHY

1. Books

Burton, C. E. College Teaching. New York: Harcours, Brace, Jovanovich, 1956.

Carey, James T. Forums and Focus in University Adult Education. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education of Adults, 1961.

Centra, J. A. The Utility of Student Ratings for Instructional Improvement. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Creager, J. A. "A Multiple-Factor Analysis of the Purdue Rating Scale for Instructors", Studies in Higher Education: Studies in College and University Staff Evaluation. LaFayette, Indiana: Purdue University, The Division of Educational Reference, 1950.

Daigheault, George H. Decision Making in The University Evening College, Research Reports. Chicago: Center for Study of Liberal Education of Adults, 1963.

Ducker, A. J. and H. H. Remmers. "Do Alumni and Students Differ in Their Attitudes Toward Instructors?" Studies in Higher Education: Studies in College and University Staff Evaluation. LaFayette, Indiana: Purdue University, The Division of Educational Reference, 1950.

Dyer, John P. Ivory Towers in the Market Place. New York: Bobbs Merrill Company, 1956.

Eckert, R. E. and R. J. Deller. A University Looks at Its Program. Minneapolis, Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Edwards, Allan L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Houle, Cyril O. Major Trends in Higher Adult Education; Notes and Essays on Education for Adults. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1959.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research, Second Edition. New York: Golt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Knowles, Malcolm S. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. New York: Association Press, 1970.

McMahon, Ernest E. An End to Confusion; Notes and Essays on Education for Adults. Chicago: Center for the Study on Liberal Education for Adults, 1965.

Miller, Richard I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1972.

_____. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1974.

Morton, John R. University Extension in the United States. Birmingham, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1953.

Peterson, Renee and William Peterson. University Adult Education. New York: Harper Brothers, 1960.

Sockloff, Alan L. and Vincent T. Deabler. The Construction of the Faculty and Course Evaluation Instrument. Philadelphia: Temple University Testing Bureau, 1971.

Trent, James W. and Arthur M. Cohen. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1973.

Travers, Robert N. W. Ed. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1973

2. Publications of the Government, Learned Societies and Other Organizations

American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Assembly on University Goals and Governance: A First Report. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Assembly, 1971.

Clasen, Robert E. et al. On-Campus - Off-Campus: A Comparison of the Demographic Characteristics, Attitudes and Opinions of Students Enrolled In On and Off Campus Graduate Level Extension Courses. Madison, Wisconsin: Center for Extension Programs in Education, University of Wisconsin, March, 1969.

Cohen, S. H. and W. G. Berger. "Dimensions of Student Ratings of College Instructors Underlying Subsequent Achievement on Course Examination", Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, No. 78.

Dahle, Thomas L. Faculty Attitudes Toward the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Oregon, paper presented at the National Seminar on Adult Education Research. Chicago, Illinois, 1969.

Frandson, Phillip et al. Comparative Study Regular Session / University Extension Courses and Students. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, Fall, 1973.

Kennedy, W. R. "The Relationship of Selected Student Characteristics to Components of Teacher / Course Evaluations Among Freshman English Students at Kent State Univeristy". Chicago, Illinois: American Education Research Association, 1972. (Unpublished.)

McNammee, Thomas. "Benett Criticizes Exetnsion Quality." Northern Star, October 30, 1974, DeKalb, Illinois.

Northern Illinois University, Office of Analytical Studies, On-Campus Student Profile. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, March, 1975. (Duplicated.)

Northern Illinois University, College of Continuing Education, 1975 Spring Semester Enrollment Record. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 1975.

Northern Illinois University, College of Continuing Education, 1975 Spring Semester Master List. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 1975.

Nyquist, Ewald B. "The Soft Pedagogy of Evening Colleges", Proceedings: AVEC Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, 1970.

Personal Correspondence with National University Extension Association, Washington, D.C., March, 1975.

3. Periodicals

Anikeeff, A. M. "Factors Affecting Student Evaluation of College Faculty Members", Journal of Applied Psychology. No. 37, 1953.

Bass, Abraham, ed. Northern Illinois University Faculty Bulletin, Volume 38, Number 3, October, 1974.

Bending, A. W. "Student Achievement in Introductory Psychology and Student Ratings of Competence and Empathy of Their Instructors", Journal of Psychology, No. 40, 1953.

_____. "The Use of Student-Rating Scales in the Evaluation of Instructors in Introductory Psychology", Journal of Educational Psychology, No. 43, 1952.

Bryant, P. T. "By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them", The Journal of Higher Education, Volume 38, 1967.

Burgess, Paul. "Reasons for Adult Participation in Group Educational Activities", Adult Education, No. 22, January, 1971.

Clasen, Robert E. "The Great Debate: On Campus / Off Campus Education", Journal of Extension, No. 1, Spring, 1971.

Detchen, L. "Shall the Student Rate the Professor", The Journal of Higher Education, No. 11, 1940.

Downie, N. W. "Student Evaluation of Faculty", The Journal of Higher Education, No. 23, 1952.

Farnum, Hollis B. "A Comparison of the Academic Aptitudes of University Extension Degree Students and Campus Students", Journal of Applied Psychology, No. 41, 1957.

Gage, N. L. "The Appraisal of College Teaching", Journal of Higher Education, No. 32, 1961.

Goodhartz, A. S. "Student Attitudes and Opinions Relating to Teaching at Brooklyn College", School and Society, No. 68, 1948.

Heilman, J. D. and W. D. Armentrout. "The Rating of College Teachers on Ten Traits by Their Students", The Journal of Educational Psychology, No. 27, 1936.

Issacson, R. L., W. J. McKeachie, and J. E. Milholland. "Dimensions of Student Evaluations of Teaching", Journal of Educational Psychology, No. 55, 1964.

Lewis, E. C. "An Investigation of Student-Teacher Interaction As A Determiner of Effective Teaching", Journal of Educational Research, No. 57, 1964.

McGrath, Earl J. and Lewis Froman. "College Aptitudes of Adult Students", University of Buffalo Studies, Volume XIV, No. 1, November, 1936.

McKeachie, J. W. "Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness: A Validity Study", American Educational Research Journal, No. 8, 1971.

_____ and D. Solomon. "Student Ratings of Instructors: A Validity Study", Journal of Educational Research, No. 51, 1958.

Perry, R. R. "Evaluation of Teaching Behavior Seeks to Measure Effectiveness", College and University Business, No. 47, 1969.

Rodin, M. and B. Rodin. "Student Evaluation of Teachers", Science Magazine, No. 177, 1972.

Wilson, W. R. "Student Rating Teachers", The Journal of Higher Education, No. 3, 1932.

4. Unpublished Materials

Curry, William J. "Academic and Motivational Characteristics of Prison Inmates in the Community College Program at North Carolina's Correctional Institutions: An Exploration Study." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1974.

Dekker, Tunis Henry. "Faculty Commitment to University Adult Education," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965.

Gibson, James Edward. "A Study of Selected Factors and Attitudes Comparing Regular Day Students With Continuing Education Students." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Arizona University, 1962.

Kennedy, W. R. "The Relationship of Selected Student Characteristics to Components of Teacher / Course Evaluations Among Freshman English Studenta at Kent State University", Unpublished paper, American Education Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1972.

Porter, Lee. "Faculty Attitudes Toward Selected Aspects of a Multidimensional University Continuing Education College." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1969.

Russell, H. E. "Interrelations of Some Indices of Instructor Effectiveness: An Exploratory Study." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1951.

Sackett, Duane H. "A Descriptive Analysis of the Evening and Off Campus Population, Temple University, Fall Semester, 1966-67." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1969.

Ulmer, Ronald Curtis. "A Comparison of the Classroom Achievement of Evening and Day Students in College Courses." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1966.

Wilde, Simpson Ownbey. "A Study of the Evaluation of Extension Courses Offered for Credit at Six State Supported Institutions of Higher Education in North Carolina." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, North Carolina University, 1965.

Zahn, Jane Cordiner. "Comparative Ability of Extension and Resident Students at the University of California." Unpublished non-degree thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1961 in Clude Touchett, Adult Education Through University Extention, Toronto, Ontario: Department of Adult Education, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968.